DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 134 24 SP 004 768

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Haefele, Donald I. |
| TITLE | AACTE Project to Disseminate Knowledge and Understanding of the Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models Developed with the Support of the National Center for Educational Research and Development, United States Office of Education. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/CE), Washington, D.C. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-9-0550 |
| PUB DATE | Jun 70 |
| GRANT | OEG-0-9-180550-4416(010) |
| NOTE | 42p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Elementary School Teachers, *Information Dissemination, Program Evaluation, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Workshops, *Teaching Models, Teaching Techniques |
| IDENTIFIERS | CETEM, Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models |

ABSTRACT

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) developed a dissemination project to inform teacher educators of the ten Comprehensive Teacher Education Models. The main activities included the organization and direction of five regional workshops, publication of newsletters, distribution of model summaries, discussions of the models at the 1970 AACTE annual meeting, publication of project papers in book form, and production of a mediated package to supplement workshop presentations. The development of the project is described, including the procedures used in planning and conducting the workshops. The workshop activities are briefly reviewed with summaries of the keynote speeches. A general evaluation indicates that the teacher education community is becoming increasingly aware of program model development efforts and that the project has encouraged continued analysis of the models. There are three appendixes: 1) a guide to the papers and other media prepared for the workshops, with objectives; 2) guidelines on how to plan a workshop; and 3) an example of a workshop evaluation form. (MBM)

ED048134

Final Report
Project No. 9-0550
Grant No. OEG-0-9-180550-4416(010)

# AACTE PROJECT TO DISSEMINATE KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ELEMENTARY TEACHER EDUCATION MODELS DEVELOPED WITH THE SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

Donald L. Haefele

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

SP004768

Project No. 9-0550
U.S. Office of Education

*The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.*

Published by

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
June 1970

## Contents


Preface . . . . . iv

Overview of the Project: How and Why . . . . . 1

Part I: Putting the Project Together . . . . . 3

Part II: Procedures in Planning and Conducting Workshops . . . . . 4

- Workshops Chosen as Basic Approach . . . . . 4
- Emphasis on Processes and Products . . . . . 6
- Selecting the Topics . . . . . 6
- Further Workshop Guidelines . . . . . 8
- Behavioral Objectives Outlined . . . . . 8
- Workshop Format Plan . . . . . 9
- Actual Workshop Program . . . . . 10
- Modification of the Program . . . . . 11
- Workshop Correctional Provision . . . . . 13
- Final Workshop Program . . . . . 14

Part III: Review of the Workshop Activities . . . . . 15

- Keynote Speeches . . . . . 16
- General Presentations . . . . . 18

Part IV: Evaluation . . . . . 20

Appendix A: A Guide to the Papers and Other Media . . . . . 23

Appendix B: How to Plan a Workshop . . . . . 31

Appendix C: Example of Workshop Evaluation Form . . . . . 34

# Preface

American teacher education took a significant step when the U. S. Office of Education developed its extensive elementary teacher education models project. The AACTE, at the request of USOE, entered the second phase of this multiphase research and development effort to disseminate information about the 10 comprehensive undergraduate and in-service teacher education model programs to colleges and universities in the United States. The Association, during the past year, has conducted this Dissemination Project--in light of its commitment to improve teacher education. The Project was one of many activities to stimulate study and action on proposals to improve teacher education.

The USOE models project was shaped by the recognition that teacher education programs should be examined as a totality and that efforts to examine discrete elements outside that totality can be unproductive. With this view in mind, the models are frequently discussed in terms of comprehensiveness and systems approach.

This final report provides an overview of the Dissemination Project from its inception, through its implementation in workshop-seminars and publications, and into projected spin-offs such as future workshops. The eventual consequence, hopefully, might be improved preservice and in-service school personnel preparation programs. Such an outcome would be welcomed by the AACTE since the Association's reason for being is one of stimulating and carrying out study, action projects, and communication activities. The AACTE is pleased to have been invited to conduct the Dissemination Project as one of many efforts to diffuse varied viewpoints and proposals relative to improved programs.

In relation to the dissemination study, the reader may find three AACTE publications useful:

1. *Systems and Modeling: Self-Renewal Approaches to Teacher Education*, a "popularized" AACTE-produced book, now in press, which includes several speeches presented at the regional dissemination workshops. (Content is described in Appendix A.)

2. *Elementary Teacher Education Models Analyzed in Relation to National Accreditation Standards* (Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1970), 14 pages.

3. *A Reader's Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers* (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Association, 1969), 342 pages.

Available for examination in the AACTE Headquarters Office are many visuals created specifically for the dissemination workshop-seminars and later adapted for use by persons collaborating with the AACTE in conducting their own sessions on the Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models. (Content is described in the introduction to the Appendices.)

Many people have contributed to the success of the Dissemination Project and to the publication of this report. An Advisory Committee helped to develop objectives and refine strategies. The Committee included: Laurence Haskew (University of Texas), Charles Bruning (University of Minnesota), Pearlie Dove (Clark College), and Don Dafoe (Council of Chief State School Officers).

Much assistance was provided by USOE's Dr. James Steffensen and Miss Shirley Steele of the National Center for Educational Research and Development. Models developers also were most helpful and supportive.

Assistance was given by Drs. Joel L. Burdin and Walter J. Mars as codirectors, by Miss Elaine Plittman, program associate to the project, and by Mrs. Brenda Greenhowe, project secretary. Certainly the project coordinator, Dr. Donald L. Haefele, the program presenters--Drs. Bruce Joyce, Keith Acheson, Walt LeBaron, Donald Cruickshank, and Horton Southworth--and the ten model directors were crucial to the success and relevance of the actual workshops-seminars. Mrs. Carol Lynn MacMahon and Mrs. Kay Shoemaker, AACTE program assistants, and Mrs. Alma Breazeale, secretary to Dr. Mars, helped the administrative efficiency of the workshops. The entire Association staff has contributed to the success of the project in far too many ways to enumerate here. The efforts of all are deeply appreciated.

Edward C. Pomeroy
*Executive Director*
*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education*

June 1970

## Overview of the Project: How and Why

The Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models (CETEM's) contain innovative approaches to teacher preparation. Because of the bulk and complexity of the CETEM's final reports, the U.S. Office of Education sought a dissemination vehicle through which the new ideas couched in the CETEM's could be presented clearly and concisely to as large an audience as possible.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, at the invitation of the U.S. Office of Education, directed a Dissemination Project to inform teacher educators of the 10 Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models developed through the U.S. Office of Education's Elementary Teacher Education Project. It was felt that the Association's communication channels would reach the large majority of professional teacher educators in the field.

The main dissemination activities included:

A. Organization and direction of five regional workshops.
B. Publication of newsletters.
C. Distribution of model summaries: Systems Development Corporation, United States Office of Education, and the Eric Clearinghouse.
D. Discussions of the models at the AACTE Annual Meeting in Chicago in February, 1970.
E. Publication of project papers in book form.
F. Production of a mediated package to supplement workshop presentations.

Workshop participants were asked to:

A. Demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of the applications of systems thinking to teacher education problems.
B. Examine their current programs using the concepts discussed throughout the workshops and planning for feasible and advantageous change.

Workshop programs were modified according to the needs of the participants as recorded on evaluation sheets. Although the comprehensive nature of the workshop content made it difficult to satisfy the needs of individual participants, the workshop series was undoubtedly successful. The education community is becoming increasingly more knowledgeable regarding the program models, and is beginning to investigate how and where it can incorporate model principles into existent programs.

With the overall purpose of providing teacher educators with information about the 10 Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models developed through the U.S. Office of Education's Elementary Teacher Education Project, the Dissemination Project offered information on the

models through five regional workshops across the country, using newsletters, model summaries (System Development Corporation, U. S. Office of Education, ERIC) distribution, and a mediated package of workshop presentations. The project activities strove to stimulate a continuing dialogue on the models.

The project staff set several goals for the participants of the project's workshop activities. It was hoped that, at the conclusion of a two-and-a-half-day workshop, a participant would be able to:

A. Demonstrate knowledge of systems analysis and how it is employed in model building.
B. Enumerate the unique and common elements incorporated within the 10 elementary education models.
C. Examine his current teacher education program in light of concepts and ideas considered in the workshops.
D. Recognize factors within his institution which could facilitate or thwart systematic program improvement.

The 10 Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models are hypotheses for training teachers to handle classroom situations more effectively. The final products contain innovative teaching techniques, bring systems thinking to teacher education problems, define the teacher's role, and delineate those behaviors which contribute to effective teaching.

The education community has need to investigate, test, and implement the ideas and processes operating within the models, for they constitute a beginning effort to plan systematically competency-based programs. Their potential use in the field is challenging.

In general, final reports on the models are read by few teacher educators because of the time involved and the lack of motivation to do so. Therefore, it was incumbent upon the National Center for Educational Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education to seek a vehicle through which the ideas in the models could be presented clearly and concisely to as large an audience as possible. Because of the abstractness and complexity of many of the ideas within the models, the Office of Education realized that the dissemination task required more than the publication of position papers. A dialogue among teacher educators, researchers, and administrators had to be established.

The objectives of the National Center for Educational Research and Development and the AACTE were compatible inasmuch as the AACTE has continually tried to respond to the needs of teacher education through the identification and dissemination of ideas to improve teacher preparation.

PART I

## Putting the Project Together

During 1967, the U. S. Office of Education expressed increased awareness of the need to update and improve present teacher preparation programs. It was decided that directed improvements in education appeared to be a more productive use of federal funds than undirected improvement programs. The Elementary Teacher Education Project was created to meet this declared need. Subsequently, a request for proposals to design Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models was issued on October 16, 1967. By January 1968, 80 proposals were received. Of these, nine received funding. Contracts were awarded on March 1, 1968, and the final reports were submitted October 31, 1968. The final reports of Phase I, e.g., the designed models of the Elementary Teacher Education Project, were used as the basis for issuing funds for Phase II of the project, the Feasibility Studies, for example, the cost and related analyses for incorporating a model into a university structure. Phase II proposals were submitted February 28, 1969, and the final reports were received January 1, 1970.

The nine institutions which received Phase I funding were:

Florida State University
Michigan State University
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Syracuse University
Teachers College, Columbia University
University of Georgia
University of Massachusetts
University of Pittsburgh
University of Toledo

All but the University of Pittsburgh and Teachers College, Columbia University received Phase II funding. In addition, the University of Wisconsin, Madison proposal was funded for Phase II.

In June of 1969, the AACTE received a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Research and Development to disseminate the program models developed in Phase I of the Elementary Teacher Education Project. The project staff, consisting of AACTE Associate Directors Walter J. Mars and Joel L. Burdin, project codirectors; Donald L. Haefele, project coordinator; and Elaine J. Plittman, program associate, planned a multiphased dissemination program. Dissemination activities included:

A. Design, development, and operation of five workshops. Procedures for the design and development of the workshops included:

    1. Determination of goals and objectives.
    2. Determination of the physical facilities, length of workshops, place, date, time, and number of participants.

3. Selection of substantive content to be communicated about the models and related ideas and information.
4. Utilization of workshop leaders and resource persons for intensive thinking and planning sessions prior to the workshops.
5. Development of communication strategies in conducting workshops and related activities to attain maximum effectiveness with individuals, organizations, and agencies.
6. Identification of resources available to and necessary for the success of the workshops.
7. Development of various kinds of materials for use in the workshops and follow-up activities, e.g. self-contained "packages" useful to teacher educators on their campuses.

B. Publication of newsletters designed to stimulate study of the models and to report project activities periodically to workshop participants, AACTE members,and others.

C. Publicizing of project activities, ideas, and certain aspects of models at the 1970 AACTE Annual Meeting.

D. Preparation and publication of a monograph or book derived from the workshop project. Such a publication would emphasize both the dissemination process and substantive content relative to model building and implementation.

E. Development of a feedback and assessment plan to provide clues to next steps in dissemination activities for the model project.

The project staff feels certain that the dissemination activities listed above added greatly to the educational community's awareness of the models and to their preparation for more comprehensive program change.

## PART II

## Procedures in Planning and Conducting Workshops

Recognizing the wide information gap between the educational community and its researchers, the U.S. Office of Education has invested some of its resources in dissemination activities. The AACTE was to disseminate information rather than develop a product or research a requested problem. This report therefore will deal with the development and description of those major dissemination efforts.

### WORKSHOPS CHOSEN AS BASIC APPROACH

The workshop format was chosen as the best vehicle for the dissemination of the models to the widest possible audience within the project's budgetary

limits. The workshop format is effective in dealing with new ideas because of its flexibility, informality, and interaction between participants and presenters. Five workshops were held: at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Temple University) on November 2, 3, and 4, 1969; Atlanta, Georgia (University of Georgia) on November 16, 17, and 18, 1969; Kansas City, Missouri (University of Missouri-Kansas City) on November 30, December 1 and 2, 1969; San Jose, California (San Jose State College) on December 7, 8, and 9, 1969; and Evanston, Illinois (National College of Education) on February 23, 24, and 25, 1970. (Note Appendix B, a brief outline for planning a workshop.)

The project staff decided that the workshop would be most effective if its audience consisted of teams selected from institutions committed to change. The staff planned each workshop for approximately 100 persons from institutions of varying kinds (for example, state or private). Each AACTE member was invited to send a team varying in size from three to five members.

The following criteria formed the basis for participant selection:

A. Ability to send a team of representatives composed of:

   1. One or two instructional decision makers (dean of academic affairs, Curriculum Department chairman, dean or assistant dean, Elementary Education Department chairman, etc.)
   2. A professor of elementary education interested in promoting change.
   3. A public school person.
   4. Possibly an undergraduate student.

B. Ability to prepare a short written statement explaining their reasons for wishing to attend the workshops.

C. Correspondence with the project staff indicating program change, proposed directions, and related interest in the workshops.

D. Institutions which submitted proposals for Phase I of the Elementary Teacher Education Project (ETEP) and were not funded (71 institutions).

E. Institutions which submitted proposals for Phase II of the ETEP and were not funded (19).

The staff also invited State Department of Education teams consisting of the following: assistant commissioner of education, director of teacher certification, and assistants of the latter.

Brochure-applications were mailed to all AACTE members and to selected non-AACTE teacher training institutions.

## EMPHASIS ON PROCESSES AND PRODUCTS

At the outset of the project, the project staff, in conference with professionals in the field, concluded that the best way to expose the participants to the models was to present the models as completely as possible through mediated presentations delivered by model representatives.

Later, it was felt that, although such an approach would inform educators *about* the models, it would not facilitate *meaningful learning* of fundamental concepts and strategies to implement change. Although the models have many unique aspects, they were structured upon common assumptions. Every model is structured around systems analysis, performance objectives, and modules. The above approach would have left only an *impression* of what the models were trying to do, yielding very little *specific* knowledge of the common and unique attributes within the models.

In consultation with M. Vere DeVault and James Anderson of the University of Wisconsin at Madison and representatives of the nine models, the Dissemination Project staff made a fundamental decision.

The most effective way of publicizing the models for the education community would be to present the *processes* and *products* within the models. In other words, the thrust of the workshop would be the presentation of ideas and approaches rather than displaying the models in their entirety.

The *process/product* approach would allow for greater specificity in establishing workshop goals and behavioral objectives. It would separate the manageable elements of the models so they could be readily presented and studied during the brief workshop period.

## SELECTING THE TOPICS

The following were identified as the most essential processes and products operating with the models and were incorporated into a proposal delivered on August 9, 1969 to the Project Advisory Committee: Laurence Haskew (University of Texas), Charles Bruning (University of Minnesota), Pearlie Dove (Clark College), and Don Dafoe (Council of Chief State School Officers).

### *Coalitions*

Extended use of media in teacher education and movements to utilize computers and develop automated devices to aid in the teaching-learning process have occurred in recent years. Industry has become increasingly aware of and involved in the area of education. Educators have united their knowledge and experience with industry's technological know-how to develop models and prototypes for large-scale individualizing of instruction. Relationships which have been established between the two groups concerning the development and cost analysis of the Elementary Teacher Education models are both extensive and mutually rewarding.

Professional educators developing the program models have also allied with academicians in liberal arts and the sciences to aid in their planning. In addition, two concortia, one consisting of several universities and the other bringing together universities, colleges, and a regional laboratory, have united resources to design two of the program models. Other interesting collaborations have been created since the inception of the Elementary Teacher Education Project.

### *Systems Analysis*

The technique of systems analysis is being increasingly employed in various areas of education to achieve various ends. Most of the model development staffs have utilized systems procedures in developing their models.

It was anticipated that treatment of this topic would prepare the institutional representatives with a method or process to focus on the examination of educational goals and alternative ways of achieving those goals within the confines of existing resource limitations.

### *Curriculum Development and Performance Objectives*

All program model staffs have had to consider extensively what content and experiences should be provided in a preservice program to prepare teachers. Several innovative approaches to curriculum development have been incorporated into each model. The treatment of content has been very creative and uncommon in its organization and absence of rigidity.

In addition, all the model teams, in varying degrees, express their educational objectives in terms of what it is a student should be able to do to demonstrate achievement of one or more objectives. There are also philosophical, procedural, and assessment considerations when an institution preparing teachers utilizes this approach.

### *Personalization*

This topic complements the behavioral approach of performance objectives. Concern for the individual and his optimal growth as a self-directing person and desire to provide for more personal student-faculty contacts and relevant learning experiences are reflected in the program models. Thus, the affective dimensions of personal growth are treated in addition to the cognitive.

### *Technology and Teacher Education*

Media (both software and hardware) are being increasingly employed in teacher education. Computer-assisted instruction language laboratories and automated self-instruction facilities are available at present to aid in preparing teachers. Teachers are also expected to know how to use audio-visual equipment to bring realistic experiences into the classroom. The application of technology to teacher education has many dimensions, and the program models have incorporated plans for utilizing the best available technology.

## FURTHER WORKSHOP GUIDELINES

Meeting on August 9, 1969, the Advisory Committee decided to emphasize the concepts of systems analysis and model design. Therefore, the keynote address would deal with systems and teacher education, followed by a technical presentation of systems and model building. Six areas of investigation were confirmed, and models were to be examined from the following perspectives:

1. Performance objectives
2. Personalization
3. Curriculum design
4. Coalitions
5. Correctional provisions (evaluation procedures)
6. "Implementability" (feasibility of implementation)

Questions for each of the above perspectives were formulated to serve as guidelines for workshop involvement. The questions were geared toward clarifying process and product. For example, to study performance objectives, the participant must answer:

> What arrangements were made in the models for deriving performance objectives? (Process)
>
> What performance objectives were developed? (Product)

Questions such as these formed the behavioral objective structure for the entire workshop. A more comprehensive list of the specific objectives follows.

## BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES OUTLINED

At the conclusion of the workshop each participant was expected to perform in specific ways to provide guidelines in planning project activities compatible with expectations:

1. Define the concept "model."
2. Define systems analysis as the concept is used in the workshop.
3. Describe how systems analysis may be utilized in model building.
4. State a rationale for the application of systems analysis in teacher education program development.
5. Define the terms performance objectives, curriculum process, coalitions, personalization, correctional provision, and implementation as they are employed in the models.
6. Describe the arrangements made in the models for deriving performance objectives.

7. Describe the performance objectives developed by each model staff.
8. State what arrangements have been made within the models for forming coalitions.
9. Identify the parties of the coalitions and describe how they interact.
10. State what domain has been identified as curriculum experience in the models.
11. Explain what process was employed to compose the curriculum of the models.
12. State what arrangements have been made for personalization in the models.
13. Describe what educational technology has been identified for use in the models and what function(s) it will serve.
14. Identify what provisions are incorporated in the models for student and component assessment.
15. Name several established criteria for reviewing model programs and student performance.
16. Discuss the resource demands required by his institution to facilitate basic model implementation.
17. Utilize the analytical perspectives considered in the workshop to analyze the elementary teacher education program at his own institution.

## WORKSHOP FORMAT PLAN

### *Preworkshop Experience*

Because of the complexity of the task of disseminating knowledge about the models, the project staff felt that preworkshop activities which gave exposure to the models and to the concepts of systems analysis were necessary to make the workshops effective. That is, it was considered important that the participants come to each workshop with some minimal level of knowledge about the models.

The preworkshop requirement plan involved an investigation of one entire model and/or a study of the model summaries (SDC, USOE).

### *The Workshop Experience*

The project staff considered having experts on each of the six selected perspectives deliver mediated presentations, followed by participant study of the perspectives within the context of two models. Two model representatives would be present in discussion groups as resource people. Any combination of two of the model institutions would be able to address itself to the six selected perspectives: systems, curriculum process, performance objectives, personalization, implementation, and correctional provision.

*The Presiding Officer*

The Advisory Committee recommended that the primary speakers should be knowledgeable in the models, but removed enough from them to be objective. Thus, the concept of the "presiding officer" was developed. The presiding officers were selected from individuals involved in various ways with Phase I or Phase II of the ETEP, but were not members of a Phase II team. Walt LeBaron, formerly of System Development Corporation; Bruce Joyce of Teachers College, Columbia University; Horton Southworth, University of Pittsburgh; Donald Cruickshank, the Ohio State University; and Keith Acheson, the University of Oregon, were selected to the program staff as presiding officers.

The entire purpose of the presiding officer was to help keep the workshops *systems oriented* and focused on *processes* rather than on the models per se. The model representatives were to be utilized as resources and the models were to furnish contexts in which one could examine the processes and products. Such an approach was intended to keep the workshop from being merely a "fashion show of models."

ACTUAL WORKSHOP PROGRAM

The program plan formulated as a result of the Advisory Committee meeting was similar to the following:

*First Half Day*

1. Orientation (Registration Welcome)
2. Keynote Address

*Second Half Day*

Systems Analysis

1. Mediated Presentation
2. Discussion (Five Groups)
3. Summary and Evaluation

*Third Half Day*

Curriculum Process (General Session)

Mediated Presentation

Performance Objectives (General Session)

*Third Half Day (continued)*

1. Mediated Presentations
2. Discussions (Five Groups)
3. Summary and Evaluation

*Fourth Half Day*

Personalization (General Session)

1. Mediated Presentation

Coalitions (General Session)

1. Mediated Presentations
2. Discussion (Five Groups)
3. Summary and Evaluation

*Fifth Half Day*

Correctional Provisions (General Session)

Mediated Presentation

*Fifth Half Day (continued)*

Implementation Demands
(General Session)

1. Mediated Presentations
2. Discussion (Five Groups)
3. Summary and Evaluation
4. Workshop Summary and Evaluation

MODIFICATION OF THE PROGRAM

The five presiding officers met on August 27, 1970 at the AACTE's request in Washington and were given the preceding design as the workshop curriculum. They were to design their own particular role within the given substantive framework. They worked with the project staff to develop the following program for the initial workshop in Philadelphia at Temple University on November 2, 3, and 4, 1969. Note that the six perspectives developed by the Advisory Committee were indirectly followed.

*First Half Day*

General Presentation TEACHER EDUCATION AND SYSTEMS Keynote Address
The project staff selected one speaker for each of five workshops to deliver a paper addressed to both educational curriculum trends and advantages inherent in the systems analysis process.

General Presentation TECHNIQUES FOR DEVELOPING A TEACHER EDUCATION MODEL
Walt Le Baron
This presentation explored the concepts of systems analysis and modeling in greater depth than the keynote speech by proposing a series of steps teacher educators could employ in planning new programs or in examining existent ones.

*Second Half Day*

Group Discussion Meeting
In an organizational session for discussion groups, individuals were assigned to discussion groups where they received a brief orientation by the presiding officer.

General Presentation VARIATIONS ON A SYSTEMS THEME Bruce Joyce
An overview of the ten models was presented illustrating unique characteristics common elements and processes and products of the ten models. Six analytical perspectives were introduced to provide guides for examining the models.

Group Discussion Meeting

Discussion groups used the analytical perspectives to guide their study of the two assigned models. The discussions revolved around the processes and products introduced in the previous general session.

*Third Half Day*

General Presentation CASE STUDY OF THE PITTSBURGH MODEL Horton Southworth

Dr. Southworth discussed the problems of model conception, organization, and implementation in the development of teacher education model. The principle referent was the University of Pittsburgh model.

General Presentation PANEL DISCUSSION Keith Acheson (Chairman)

A panel of presiding officers and model directors responded to a presentation by Keith Acheson on the arrangements for coalitions in the models. Opportunities were provided for participant response to panel members.

Group Discussion Meeting

The discussion groups used the previous presentations to guide their study of two models.

*Fourth Half Day*

General Presentation SOME CONSIDERATIONS UPON ENTERING INTO NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS Donald Cruickshank

This presentation outlined factors to be considered when the decision has been made to modify a teacher education program by the incorporation of ideas contained in the model program.

Group Discussion Meeting IMPLEMENTING A MODEL

Each model director spoke to his discussion group on the problems of implementing a model.

*Fifth Half Day*

General Presentation A FORWARD LOOK AT PHASE III James Steffenson

Dr. Steffensen, chief of the Organization and Administration Studies Branch, National Center for Educational Research and Development, commented on the present state of the USOE project from the Federal viewpoint.

Team Discussion Sessions "WHAT NEXT?" SESSION

During this session, teams reassembled to complete a questionnaire. They were asked to respond to such questions as: "What useful ideas, concepts, etc., were discussed in the workshop which were advantageous to incorporate into teacher education programs?" "What were the strong and weak points of the workshop?" "How can the AACTE workshop

staff or other personnel assist in implementing the change(s) planned?"

Group Discussion Session
Review of workshop activities and return to staff of evaluation forms.

## WORKSHOP CORRECTIONAL PROVISION

The project staff and discussion leaders did not hold rigidly to a pre-established program structure when participant feedback disclosed a need for other kinds of program activities. Feedback was sought through formal and informal means. Participants were continually encouraged to make known their needs for special help and answers to questions.

At the conclusion of each day of the workshop, participants were asked to fill in note cards stating their suggestions and criticisms. Also, a three-page evaluation form was circulated during registration for completion during the workshop and collection at the workshop's closure. Participants were requested to react to workshop presentations and discussion sessions and to relay general suggestions. As a result, various "in house" changes took place during the five workshops. Presentation scripts were continually revised. Slides were improved. During the first workshop, discussion sessions were assigned. At later workshops, participants could choose their discussion sessions freely. The ERIC *Reader's Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers* was completed and mailed to all participants before the Evanston workshop. Bruce Joyce's paper, "Variations on a Systems Theme," was duplicated and distributed at Kansas City, San Jose, and Evanston.

The workshop formats varied. For example, the second workshop, in Atlanta, had very few general session (lecture) presentations. (The Philadelphia feedback indicated that group sessions were more meaningful than the large general presentation sessions.) Each presiding officer held a group discussion on his individual specialty. (See final workshop program on the following page.) Participants could select which discussion they wished to attend. Presiding officers gave their presentations twice--to different groups of participants. Participants, then, could choose two points of focus and study the models more deeply from a narrower perspective.

At Atlanta, the model director was more actively involved than at Philadelphia. Each model director led a group session which studied his particular model through the six designated perspectives: performance objectives, curriculum process, personalization, coalitions, correctional provisions, and implementation demands. Participants chose their groups.

The Kansas City format combined the Philadelphia and Atlanta designs. The first day of the workshop was entirely a general session. There were two general session panels, one which discussed the models from the perspectives of performance objectives, curriculum process, and

personalization, and a second which examined Phase II proposals (feasibility studies) from the perspectives of coalitions, correctional provisions, and implementation demands.

The U. S. Office of Education is sponsoring a program whereby 10 developing instituions prepare a model or adopt one of the CETEM's into their own program. E. C. Powell, of Jarvis Christian College, discussed the "Developing Institutions' Viewpoint on Program Change" at the Kansas City workshop.

As at Georgia, each group session had a different topic. Also at Kansas City, the staff held postconference sessions to discuss individual situations and problems.

The San Jose and Evanston (Illinois) workshops followed closely the program of the Kansas City workshop.

## FINAL WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Below is a copy of the National College of Education Workshop. When comparing it to the Philadelphia schedule note the variety of group sessions and the flexible scheduling of general and group sessions.

*First Half Day*

Keynote Address: VARIATIONS ON A BRAVE NEW WORLD Bruce Joyce
Dr. Joyce addressed the assembly on two grave problems facing the schools today: first, the educational bureaucracy and, secondly, the difficult teacher role. He then gave a brief report on how the models approached these problems.

General Presentation THE ELEMENTARY TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT James Steffensen

General Presentation PANEL DISCUSSION ON SEVEN MODELS
The model representatives present at the Evanston workshop and several of the presiding officers held a panel discussion summarizing characteristic features of their particular model. The panel discussion was open to participant questions and reactions.

*Second Half Day*

General Presentation SYSTEMS ANALYSIS AND TEACHER EDUCATION
Walt LeBaron

Discussion Sessions: Participants could attend any one of the following discussion sessions:

A. University of Massachusetts and Michigan State University Models
B. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and University of Georgia Models

C. Institutional Change (procedures for and problems associated with effecting program change in institutions possessing limited resources)
D. Systems Analysis and Model Building (role-playing techniques utilized to study the systems analysis and model building processes)
E. Building Laboratories for Teacher Education
F. Practical Considerations for Modifying an Existing Program (where and how to initiate program change)

*Third Half Day*

General Presentation — COALITIONS — Keith Acheson

General Presentation — SOME CONSIDERATIONS UPON ENTERING INTO NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR PREPARATION OF TEACHERS — Donald Cruickshank

Discussion Sessions: (Participants could attend one of the sessions enumerated under the second half day.)

*Fourth Half Day*

General Presentation — PANEL PRESENTATION OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDIES — Keith Acheson (Chairman)

Group Discussion Session: (Participants could attend one of the following discussion sessions.)

A. University of Massachusetts Feasibility Study
B. Michigan State University Feasibility Study
C. Oregon College of Education Feasibility Study
D. University of Georgia Feasibility Study
E. Ohio Consortium Feasibility Study

General Presentation — SUMMARY AND A LOOK AHEAD — Walter J. Mars

Adjournment

Postworkshop sessions for those wishing to speak to program presenters about individual situation problems.

## PART III

## Review of the Workshop Activities

The following is a brief review of the major workshop presentations. Section A summarizes the keynote speeches. Robert Howsam, dean of the College of Education, University of Houston, keynoted the Philadelphia

and Atlanta workshops. Harold Shane, university professor of education, Indiana University, keynoted the Kansas City, Missouri workshop. James Popham, associate professor of education at the University of California, Los Angeles, delivered the keynote address at San Jose, and Bruce Joyce of Teachers College, Columbia University began the Evanston, Illinois workshop.

Section B summarizes the general session presentations delivered, for the most part, by the workshop "presiding officers."

*Keynote Speeches*

1. TEACHER EDUCATION AND SYSTEMS - Robert Howsam
(Part II of Appendix A)

Robert Howsam, dean of the College of Education, University of Houston, delivered keynote addresses at the Temple University and the University of Georgia workshop. On both occasions he indicated the significant potential inherent in the technique of systems analysis for analyzing and planning current and future programs in teacher education. He noted that one of the greatest needs today is for the inclusion of a feedback mechanism in our current programs to serve as a correctional provision. In addition, Howsam emphasized that systemic planning forces one to identify and assess his efficacy program alternatives in relation to specified instructional goals and objectives.

2. DESIGNING CHANGES IN TEACHER EDUCATION THROUGH FUTURE PLANNING: THE ROLE OF SYSTEMS THEORY - Harold Shane
(Part III of Appendix A)

Harold Shane, university professor at Indiana University, delivered the keynote speech at the Kansas City workshop and utilized an approach much different from Robert Howsam's. He focused on the concept of future-planning, emphasizing the need and means we have available to determine or plan our future which, noted Shane, should be interpreted as fan shaped and comprised of a wide range of multiple future alternatives rather than a linear path unraveling before us. We should thus look at these fan-shaped futures, weigh them in the light of our values, identify which ones we believe are superior, and implement them. He indicated that the systems approach provides steps which, when carried out, can assure attainment of the future we most desire. Some reasonable conjectures about our future which Shane felt have implications for teacher education include changes in: policies affecting education and consequently teacher education, organizational structures, instructional and related practices, technology, faculty deployment, and, finally, production of bio-teachers knowledgeable in the chemistry of learning.

3. TEACHER EDUCATION AND SYSTEMS - James Popham
(Part IV of Appendix A)

The keynote speaker at the San Jose State College workshop was James Popham, associate professor in the University of California at Los Angeles

Graduate School. Popham indicated that three conditions must be satisfied in using systems analysis for planning teacher education programs. First, the system being studied must be "isolatible." Second, the system being studied must be one for which well-developed research and design tools exist. Specification of the objectives for the system is the third necessary condition. Regarding the first and third necessary conditions, teacher education passes the test, stated Popham. That is, we can isolate the subsystems of teacher education which, in combination, compose a suprasystem.

Popham said of his third condition that the models do an excellent job of specifying the objectives for teacher education. Teacher education and education in general, however, fall short on condition number two. That is, we do not possess adequate research and design tools. When it comes to summative research (comparing one thing with another), we have the tools and know-how. However, there is a paucity of research and design methodology in the domain of formative research (contrasting one thing with itself to improve it). To ameliorate the latter problem, Popham felt we need to establish criterion reference measures.

4. EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS AND THE ELEMENTARY TEACHER EDUCATION MODELS - Bruce Joyce
(Part V of Appendix A)

Bruce Joyce, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University and director of the Teachers College Model, delivered the keynote address at the National College of Education workshop in Evanston, Illinois. Dr. Joyce addressed his remarks to two pressing problems of the classroom; the first, a bad bureaucracy and the second, a difficult teacher role. Joyce saw the problem as compounded by the hardened routinized methods necessitated by teaching conditions.

After painting a bleak but realistic picture of our schools today, Dr. Joyce spoke of the models approach to teacher preparation for this "real world" of the classroom. There are seven assumptions common to all the models:

1. Nearly all the teams saw the teacher as a clinician, one who can diagnose a problem or prescribe a series of alternative remedies for the problem.

2. All models saw the teacher as a member of a team rather than as a sole tester of hypotheses. Specialized staffing and team teaching were encouraged.

3. All the models constructed a modular curriculum to train teachers. The directors built a performance model in terms of behavioral objectives and presented these objectives with models for achieving them.

4. All the models assumed that a management and control system could be developed to monitor a program and to help individualize and personalize the program.

5. All the models assumed that any teacher who entered the classroom needed a long period of training; a consortium of colleges and school districts was considered essential to academic training.

6. All the models assumed that the "real world" of the classroom was too complex for a training program and that simulation laboratories were a more effective way of teaching skills.

7. All the models assumed that the teacher was a behavioral scientist.

*General Presentations*

1. VARIATIONS ON A SYSTEMS THEME: METHODOLOGIES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION - Bruce Joyce
(Part VI of Appendix A)

A comparative analysis of the ten CETEM's was presented at each workshop by Bruce Joyce. Joyce's investigation of the models identified eight *common assumptions* made by each of the ten teams. The assumptions were built around such concepts as: the teacher as a clinician, career ladders, performance modules, management and control systems, consortia of colleges and school districts preparing teachers, graduational simulation-to-real-world experiences, and the teacher as an applied scientist. Joyce utilized some stances from which one could investigate the variability of approaches to model building taken by several model teams: nature of the model, derivation of performance objectives, individualization and personalization, and management and control systems. The bulk of Joyce's presentation relates the application of these stances to the models in an insightful manner. In summary, he stated "the first generation application of systematic program planning techniques to teacher education is here and its products can be applied to a variety of teacher training problems."

2. A FORWARD LOOK TO PHASE III - James Steffensen

An overview of Phases I and II and some projected ideas for the development of Phase III of the Elementary Teacher Education Project were reported by James Steffensen. Included in his presentation were a history of the project, the criteria for Phase I and Phase II proposals, and a description of the proposal design and selection-for-funding process. In addition, Steffensen cited the effort being made to aid 10 "developing institutions" in conducting self-studies and analyses of the models.

3. TECHNIQUES DEVELOPING A TEACHER EDUCATION MODEL - Walt LeBaron

At each workshop, a major presentation on systems analysis was delivered by Walt LeBaron. He described the major characteristics of the systems approach and enumerated the fundamental steps one would employ in applying this technique to program planning and revision. Paraphrasing LeBaron, a model is an analogy which describes a domain of interest or system, defines the parts of a system, and shows the relationship between those parts. In general, the term system is synonymous with process. When applying the systems approach to the process of teacher education, LeBaron suggested a systems analyst would pose the following questions: What are the functions and tasks? What experience would reinforce that knowledge and give the prospective teacher the chance to practice the tasks? How can this analysis of functions and concomitant knowledge and experiences be stated in terms of program goals? How could a program of teacher preparation be organized to achieve these goals?

Concepts such as systems, systems approach, and model and model building were catalysts for discussions and small group sessions.

4. SOME CONSIDERATIONS UPON ENTERING INTO NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS - Donald Cruickshank
(Part VII of Appendix A)

Donald Cruickshank delivered a general session presentation entitled "Some Considerations Upon Entering Into New Arrangements for the Preparation of Teachers." Cruickshank emphasized that "only recently have colleges and departments of education made efforts to design new programs." He supported the hypothesis with an outline of supportive literature in teacher education. Change occurs in three stages: (1) initiation, followed by (2) legitimation, followed by, (3) congruence, asserted Cruickshank. He provided detailed descriptions of the stages and a list of constraints which inhibit program change. Some of these are: seriousness of purpose, evaluation, lack of theoretical framework, development of new curriculum materials, and faculty obsolescence.

5. COALITIONS - Keith Acheson

The concept of coalitions was presented to the participants by Keith Acheson. A coalition is a temporary alliance of distinct parties which have common goals. As Dr. Acheson indicated, several interesting coalitions consisting of colleges, industrial companies, government agencies, and others have been formed to achieve material ends. He suggested that we may see the emergence of a number of interesting coalitions heretofore never considered. It is quite apparent that teacher education, industry, or government cannot adequately prepare effective teachers without pooling efforts and resources.

*Discussion Group Sessions*

In general, the small group discussion sessions succeeded in providing involvement, interaction, and answers to participant questions concerning the CETEM's. The group sessions varied in nature. To aid the participants, some models were "paired" in small group sessions for comparative study.

Horton Southworth offered a group discussion session on "model building." By utilizing quasi-role playing situations to involve the participants in discussion, Southworth provided insight into the process of model development. The Pittsburgh Model was the chief referent. Walt LeBaron formed a discussion group to investigate, at some length, the systems approach. At the third and fourth workshop, LeBaron utilized role-playing materials developed to enable participants to actively see systems at work.

Conducting a discussion session on institution change, Don Cruickshank and his group examined procedures for and problems associated with effecting program change in institutions possessing limited resources.

## PART IV

## Evaluation

This section of the report relates some general observations of workshop evaluation.

The workshop serviced diverse kinds of institutions, from the small private parochial teachers college to large land grant multi-universities. In two and one-half days, the workshop leaders informed individuals from varied background and institutional environments of the basic processes working within the models. Participants ranged from those very sophisticated in their knowledge of the models to those who knew very little about them. A review of participant comments solicited by the project staff and the "presiding officers" revealed that most of those in attendance felt they had extracted much information about the models. Some general presentations and discussion group sessions received low ratings as demonstrated by the subjective evaluation forms distributed and collected at the end of each workshop. (See evaluation form in Appendix C.)

The project staff's feeling is that the comprehensive nature of the workshop content has made it difficult to satisfy the needs of every participant. There is no doubt, however, that we have succeeded in conducting a good series of workshops. The teacher education community is becoming increasingly more aware of the "first generation" program model development efforts. This project has played a part in promoting

efforts to enjoin teacher educators to continue analyzing the elements and processes in the models and investigating how, where appropriate, some or many of these elements and processes can be incorporated into their own teacher preparation programs.

# Appendices

*As indicated on page 3, one of the tasks established for the AACTE Dissemination Project was to develop media (papers, films, slides, audio-tapes, etc.) which explained the processes and products that emerged from the CETEM's design efforts. The media would be selected and arranged for inclusion in a compatible "package."*

*Because there are not enough mediated "packages" to send out with each copy of the final report, the Project staff developed* **A Guide to the Papers and Other Media Prepared for Use in the AACTE Dissemination Project Workshops.** *It is recommended that the* **Guide** *be detached, reproduced, and sent (in lieu of the entire final report) to teacher educators and others who inquire about the availability of the media.*

APPENDIX A

## A Guide to the Papers and Other Media Prepared for Use in the AACTE Dissemination Project Workshops

The Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models contain several thousand pages of varied processes for improving preparation programs for preservice teachers. As models, they are descriptions of innovative approaches to the task. Since few teacher educators have time to examine the documents from cover to cover, AACTE-Dissemination Project brought teacher educators and others together in workshops to study the models, particularly the processes and products within them.

Papers and accompanying media have been prepared for use in the workshops. Significant processes and products associated with the model design efforts are examined in depth in the media.

This section of the final report is reserved for presenting the Guide which explains (1) what topics were considered by the presenters in the workshops; (2) who the presenters were; (3) what they discussed within each topic; and (4) what learning outcomes can be anticipated for those who study the papers. Other media (videotape, 16mm film, slides, etc.) can be obtained on loan by writing to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.[1]

It is recommended that the user of this mediated package preview the materials in the following step sequence before attempting to use them with an audience:

A. Study the Guide completely, noting the presentations which are described, the form of media, and the specified objectives.
B. Using the slides, audiotape, and script furnished in Part I of the Guide, preview the Overview of the Dissemination Project Activities and Workshop Content.

The *Overview* summarizes many of the major ideas presented in the papers and other media. In addition, the *Overview* contains cross-references to the *Guide*.

If any of the materials are damaged when you receive them or become damaged in the course of using them, please inform AACTE.

---

[1]A complete set of mediated materials or parts of the total package are available, under certain conditions delineated to assure effective use, from: AACTE, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

PART I

OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT
ACTIVITIES AND WORKSHOP CONTENT

A. *Media:*

1. A set of 35 mm slides (in a Kodak Carrousel slide tray) and an accompanying audiotaped sound track.
2. A script of the audiotaped sound track.

B. *Description:*

The complete set of slides is arranged in six sections. The audiotape may be intermittently stopped to permit more time for examination of the visuals and/or discussion of the information presented. Sections and their contents are:

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1 | The AACTE Dissemination Project goals and workshop activities (four slides). |
| Section 2 | The USOE Elementary Teacher Education Project (seven slides). |
| Section 3 | Systems theory (13 slides). |
| Section 4 | Commonalities of assumptions contained in the models (four slides). |
| Section 5 | A stage theory of change (eight slides). |
| Section 6 | Summary (one slide). |

C. *Objectives:*

After engaging in an intensive review of this slide-audiotaped presentation, you should be able to:

1. Describe the phases of the USOE Elementary Teacher Education Project.
2. State accepted assumptions about teacher education which underpin the Elementary Teacher Education Project.
3. Explain the fundamental concept of "system," naming the basic elements and describing how they function.
4. Describe six steps frequently utilized in analyzing a system.
5. Determine appropriate areas where systems analysis may or may not be applied and explain why.
6. Describe the basic design and function of a module.
7. Identify and discuss common assumptions upon which the 10 models were developed.
8. Discuss several conceptual stances for model analysis.
9. Describe the stage theory of change.
10. List and discuss questions which help to determine the adequacy of a model and/or your own operational program.
11. State some constraints on the change process when applied to teacher education.

## PART II

## TEACHER EDUCATION AND SYSTEMS

A keynote speech by Robert Howsam, dean, College of Education, University of Houston.

*A. Media:*

1. A black and white 16mm film, approximately 30 minutes in length.
2. A printed copy, 18 pages in length.[2]

*B. Description:*

The first section of Dr. Howsam's film and printed copy presents some observations on teacher education and questions for future planners to consider. In the second half of the presentation, Dr. Howsam attends to the general concept of system, particularly the attributes of efficient systems.

*C. Objectives:*

When you have completed a review of the film or the printed copy, you should be able to:

1. State a rationale for continual examination of institutional goals and existing processes for achieving such goals.
2. Define the concept of "systems."
3. List some of the characteristics of optimal systems.
4. State some properties of optimal systems.
5. Describe education, in general, and teacher education, specifically, as systems.
6. State some issues the teaching profession must face as it attempts to revise the system of teacher education.
7. Describe the basic kinds and function(s) of feedback in systems.
8. Discuss some basic steps for designing a system or a subsystem, and how to maintain optimal functioning.

---

[2] For copies of the keynote speeches cited in Appendix A, consult *Systems and Modeling: Self-Renewal Approaches to Teacher Education*, to be published by AACTE.

## PART III

## DESIGNING CHANGES IN TEACHER EDUCATION THROUGH FUTURE-PLANNING: THE ROLE OF SYSTEMS THEORY

A keynote speech by Harold Shane, university professor, Indiana University.

*A. Media:*

1. Printed copy.
2. Audiotape (half-track, 3 3/4 ips).

*B. Description:*

Dr. Shane discusses the application of a systemic strategy to the planning of the future, cites problems which confront our world, and presents several challenges to teacher education.

*C. Objectives:*

After reading Dr. Shane's paper and/or listening to the audiotape, you should be able to:

1. Discuss the concept of *future* planning.
2. State the relationship(s) between systems theory and future planning.
3. Explain how policies in education might change in the '70's.
4. Discuss new practices which are suggested by the above new policies.

## PART IV

## TEACHER EDUCATION AND SYSTEMS

A keynote address presented by James Popham, associate professor, the University of California at Los Angeles.

*A. Media:*

1. Printed copy.
2. Audiotape (half-track, 3 3/4 ips).

*B. Description:*

Dr. Popham examines systems analysis with a critical eye, calling attention to the proper interpretation and application of systems

techniques in education, particularly within the teacher education models. In light prose, Dr. Popham recites a personal case history of how he became concerned with curriculum development and also a proponent of performance objectives.

C. *Objectives:*

Having read Dr. Popham's paper and/or listened to the audiotape of his keynote speech, you should be able to:

1. Explain how your personal philosophy for preparing teachers differs and/or coincides with Dr. Popham's.
2. List three conditions which Oettinger claims must be satisfied.
3. Discuss whether or not teacher education and the models meet the three conditions.
4. Describe the approach Dr. Popham has determined most promising for increasing teaching proficiency.
5. Discuss the rigorous demands,that are placed, according to Dr. Popham, on the teacher educator who elects to use systems approaches in deciding what to teach.

## PART V

## EDUCATION PROBLEMS AND THE ELEMENTARY TEACHER EDUCATION MODELS

A keynote address presented by Bruce Joyce, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University.

A. *Media:*

1. Audiotape
2. Printed copy

B. *Description:*

Dr. Joyce describes the immense task undertaken by the 10 teams in their efforts to reconceptualize teacher education. The major thrust of the paper is to examine two problems he believes are associated with our public school systems: a bad bureaucracy and a difficult teacher role.

C. *Objectives:*

When you have studied Dr. Joyce's paper, you should be able to:

1. Discuss his accusation that our present school systems are heavily bureaucratic.
2. Describe some prominent factors which contribute to a lack of curricular heterogeneity among schools.

3. Discuss some major problems which confront the teacher who seeks to determine and provide for student individual differences.
4. Cite some research evidence provided by Dr. Joyce which indicates how the student teacher's and the first-year teacher's classroom behavioral patterns tend to change over the initial months of teaching.
5. List some conceptions of the teaching role presented in the elementary teacher education models.

## PART VI

## VARIATIONS ON A SYSTEMS THEME: METHODOLOGIES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

A presentation by Bruce Joyce, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

*A. Media:*

1. Videotape (SONY ½-inch recording: 45 minutes).
2. Printed copy (95 pages)--to be used in conjunction with the videotaped presentation.

*B. Description:*

In the videotaped presentation, Dr. Bruce Joyce, the principal designer of the Teachers College, Columbia University Model, discusses the preparation and procedures of the model teams during the eight months of Phase I, the model design phase. A large portion of the presentation focuses on Dr. Joyce's discussion of the assumptions around which the 10 teams constructed their models. His paper furnishes a more intensive overview than the videotaped presentation of the models with respect to the concepts he provides for analyzing the Phase I products.

*C. Objectives:*

After reviewing the videotape and/or printed copy, you should be able to:

1. Describe the conditions under which the models were produced.
2. State and discuss common assumptions made by the model development teams throughout their task.
3. Differentiate the nature of each model with respect to the conception of the teacher's role.
4. Describe how performance objectives were derived within several of the models.

PART VI (CONTINUED)

5. Discuss the nature and type of program model components.
6. Describe the interrelationships of the components.
7. State what provisions have been established for maximizing individualization and personalization in the models.
8. Explain how feedback is furnished to students, faculty, and to the overall management and control function.

PART VII

## SOME CONSIDERATIONS UPON ENTERING INTO NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

A presentation by Donald Cruickshank, chairman and professor, The Department of Early and Middle Childhood Education, The Ohio State University.

*A. Media:*

1. Printed copy.
2. 16 transparencies.

*B. Description:*

Dr. Cruickshank's paper opens with a historical perspective for change in teacher education. He then presents a contemporary stage theory of change in conjunction with some practical considerations for those involved in preparing and/or revising curricula or total programs for preparing teachers.

*C. Objectives:*

When you have completed the study of Dr. Cruickshank's paper, you should be able to:

1. Discuss a historical context for the preparation of teachers.
2. State what kinds of change, as asserted by Bennis, are available to program decision makers in the Initiation Stage.
3. List and discuss some evaluative criteria for adopting an existing model or examining your existing program.
4. Respond in defense of your program model to questions such as:

   a. What observable behaviors should trainees be able to demonstrate?
   b. What program experiences will provide the trainees with the desired behaviors?

PART VII (CONTINUED)

c. How can attainment be measured?
d. How will the program provide for renewing behaviors and maintenance of them at acceptable levels?

5. Describe the nature of the Legitimation Stage and the Congruence Stage.
6. List the constraints which may retard or thwart planned change and discuss their implications for your program and/or the models.

APPENDIX B

## How to Plan a Workshop

Here are some general guidelines for organizing a well-planned and smoothly, run conference.

A. *Establish a local planning committee.* It is best to utilize many people in the planning and decision-making stages of workshop organization.

B. *Determine the workshop purpose.*

C. *Establish workshop goals.* In behavioral terms, state what the workshop participants should be able to do at the conclusion of the workshop. How and in what ways do you expect the workshop to modify behavior? Note that the program and goals should be manageable in terms of outcomes to be expected, number of participants to be invited, and physical facilities to be used.

D. *Decide on the type and size of audience.* Where are they in terms of understanding the issues and readiness to act? How far do you expect to take them in terms of understanding or action?

E. *Determine the length, place, and date of the workshop.*

F. *Design the program.*

1. Focus on the workshop purpose and objectives.
2. Build in procedure to accomplish the purpose and goals. Plan a workshop strategy that best facilitates learning. Use a variety of techniques in operating the conference. There are many procedures for involving participants. For example:

    . Small discussion groups
    . General sessions for informing, reporting and
    . Exchanging ideas, setting priorities
    . Panels
    . Question-and-answer periods
    . Presentations by speakers of note

3. Develop orientation and preworkshop materials necessary for a smoothly run, relevant workshop.
4. Identify workshop leaders with care, choosing good leadership qualities and strong substantive backgrounds.
5. Identify leadership responsibilities in detail and inform leaders of their duties.

6. Have an orientation session for leaders. (It is a good idea to allow leaders to voice opinions in program planning and role placement. Only the individual leader knows under what circumstances he works most effectively.)
7. Divide the program phases into minutes.
8. Construct a correctional feedback system allowing for flexibility in the program. (Notecards or evaluation sheets which are periodically completed and collected should be provided.)
9. Plan your program within budgetary limits.

G. *Take stock of your resources:*

1. Existent resources.

   a. Budget
   b. AACTE media package
   c. ERIC, USOE, SDC model summaries

2. Resources needed.

   a. Equipment

      Public address system
      Audiotape recorders
      Videotape recorder
      Notecards and blackboards
      Mimeo or duplicating machinery
      Overhead projector
      16mm projector
      Slide projector

   b. Workshop materials

      Substantive papers
      Pads, pens, programs, rosters, maps
      News releases
      Notecards and feedback materials

   c. Staff

      Secretary
      Electrician
      Contact people to aid in problems of housing, menus, and equipment
      Photographer

   d. Physical facilities

      Housing for participants
      Meals

Physical layout for a convenient, smooth running conference (rooms, chairs, ashtrays, heating, visibility, rest rooms, available medical aid, etc.)
Conference office or local headquarters for participants to leave messages, for workshop personnel to hold meetings, etc.
Registration area

*H. Utilize public relations:*

1. Design a brochure describing workshop.
2. Mail out application or invitation to attend workshop.
3. Publish newsletters publicizing conference.

# APPENDIX C

## Example of Workshop Evaluation Form

*Since workshop programs were conducted in five regions, evaluation forms varied in terms of keynote speakers, session leaders, and discussion groups. However, contents of the evaluation forms were similar; the sample form reproduced here is typical of those filled out by workshop participants. Missing are names of speakers.*

*For background on the forms, consult Part IV of the paper on evaluation.*

*THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION*
*One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036*

## AACTE Dissemination Project Seminar-Workshop Evaluation Form

Name _____

Date _____

A. Please indicate below your rating of the general presentation and the discussion sessions in which you participated during the workshop. If you wish to comment on each, space is provided.

| | | LO | | | | HI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Keynote Speech<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Elementary Teacher Education Project Overview<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Panel Discussion: The Elementary Teacher Education Models (Monday evening)<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Systems Analysis<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Coalitions<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Some Considerations upon Entering into New Arrangements for the Preparation of Teachers<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Panel Discussion: The Feasibility Studies (Wednesday morning)<br>Comments: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

8. Provision is made below for you to comment on the various discussion sessions. Please indicate the *title* of the group session you are commenting on and the *name(s)* of the discussion leader(s).

   a. Discussion Group Title: _____
      Name(s) of Leader(s): _____
      Comments: _____
      _____

   b. Discussion Group Title: _____
      Name(s) of Leader(s): _____

Comments: _____
_____

c. Discussion Group Title: _____
Name(s) of Leader(s): _____
Comments: _____
_____

d. Discussion Group Title: _____
Name(s) of Leader(s): _____
Comments: _____
_____

e. Discussion Group Title: _____
Name(s) of Leader(s): _____
Comments: _____
_____

f. Discussion Group Title: _____
Name(s) of Leader(s): _____
Comments: _____
_____

B. To assist the project staff, presenters, and discussion leaders in improving each phase of the workshop, please indicate some of the strong points of this Dissemination Project Seminar-Workshop and suggestions for improvement.

1. Strong Points:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Suggestions for Improvement:

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. If the AACTE Dissemination Project staff conducts more seminar-workshops, involving a greater number of public school personnel, what parts of the program, if any, should be:

1. Retained? _____

2. Deleted? _____

D. What other program changes do you suggest we make?

E. Can the AACTE Dissemination Project staff or program personnel be of of assistance to you in your future planning? If so, please indicate how.